

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application in view of the remarks following is respectfully requested.

The Application includes Claims 1-55, of which Claims 28-29, 33-34, and 41-44 have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 35-37, 39-40, 45-48, and 50-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claims 38 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 55 has been objected to.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of Claim 55, namely, "said apparatus further comprising a liquid inlet and a liquid outlet placed in said housing on opposite sides of an area of the skin to be treated, so that the liquid flows across the area." Claim 55 has been canceled.

Finally, new Claims 56-57 have been added, support for which may be found in the application, for example, as follows:

Claim 56 - fig. 2 and page 6, line 17

Claim 57 – page 8, line 3

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

In this section of the Office Action, Claims 1-7, 35-37, 39-40, 45-48, and 50-54 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,579,123). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner has stated (paragraph 5 of the Office Action) that Chen et al. do not suggest the limitation of Claim 55, namely apparatus including "a liquid inlet and a liquid outlet placed in said housing on opposite sides of an area of the skin to be treated, so that the liquid flows across the area." In view of the fact that Claim 1 has been amended to include this limitation, as noted above, it is submitted that amended Claim 1 is not anticipated by Chen et al. and is, therefore, allowable. It is further submitted that Claims 2-7, 35-37, 39-40, 45-48, and 50-54 are allowable, as they depend from allowable amended Claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In paragraph (3) of the Office Action, Claim 38 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. as applied to Claim 37, and further in

view of Glascock et al. (US Patent No. 5,585,565). Additionally, in paragraph (4) of the Office Action, Claim 49 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. as applied to Claim 48, and further in view of Rosenberg. (US Patent No. 7,128,719). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

It is submitted that Claims 37 and 49 are allowable, as they are dependent on allowable amended Claim 1.

As noted above, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include this limitation Chen et al. do not show or suggest such a device, as noted by the Examiner.

Glascock et al. teach a method of ultrasonic inspection of tubing.

Rosenberg teaches a system for enhanced chemical debridement.

Neither of the additional cited references, Glascock et al. and Rosenberg, teaches the limitations found in amended Claim 1, namely "a liquid inlet and a liquid outlet placed in said housing on opposite sides of an area of the skin to be treated, so that the liquid flows across the area."

Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that amended Claim 1 is patentable over Chen et al. in view of Glascock et al. and is patentable over Chen et al. in view of Rosenberg. It is further submitted that Claims 37 and 49 are allowable, as they depend from allowable amended independent Claim 1.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-7, 35-40, 45-54 and new Claims 56-57 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason H. Rosenblum/

Jason H. Rosenblum
Registration No. 56,437
Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: May 24, 2011